







# The Principia.

C. M. CLAY, JR. AND H. H. HARRIS JR.

[illegible][illegible]

REMARKS.  
The Letter of Mr. FLEET, which Mr. CLAY alludes to, may be one which, we think, we have not seen, and will thank any one for a copy of it. He is doubtless able to answer for himself. We shall make some miscellaneous remarks and reply to what Mr. Clay says of THE PRINCIPAL.

1. In the first place, if anybody has misrepresented Mr. Clay, we know not who is guilty of it, or how it has become so. THE PRINCIPLES has published whatever has come to hand, from his pen, or speeches, which would serve to determine his position. If Mr. Clay suffers at all, in the eyes of his old anti-slavery friends, it is solely on account of what he says of himself, and of the course he has pursued.

2. The above Letter so far from disproving what Mr. T. has said, "that the Free Pressmen have alleged, or even proved, their statements," points that out again. It is evident, that the one who is to be left left—He did not say the removal of Mr. Fox and the Radicals of Kentucky from the State by an insurrection, but he did say that the majority of doing it by statutory enactment was a "crime." This is precisely what he has been repeatedly saying. On your view of the *Character* of a crime, and as thus stated by himself, he induces Mr. T. to say that even "Radical" offences of opinion are not in the expression of it, we shall have to take account of the State of New York, said Mr. Clay and that, which is to him, concerning the limitations of the rights of Free Press, shall obtain Full Federal Power. Now, the present day, the country has yet gone so far, in this regard, as to be putting upon the "Radicals" and "Radical" Pressmen of the various States, by legislative enactment, the same as nothing of the kind has been limited or done since the years 1792-3, by some, with

judicial" whether in Kentucky or elsewhere, we ought perhaps, to tender our grateful acknowledgments to Mr. May for his kindness and "sympathy"—and "enmity"—in proposing to rescue us from the violence of mobs, by the substitution of persecuting Statutes. His professions may be truthful and sincere, for the Judges who sentenced John Burleigh to imprisonment, are said to have sympathized with him, and to have labored with him to obtain from him some concessions as should mitigate the sentence, or win the Royal clemency, for his release. But we have, somehow, imbibed the idea of demanding a recognition of our rights, instead of asking for "sympathy."

3. Mr. Clay utterly fails of making a truthful statement when he says:

"THE PRINCIPIA, the New York organ, cannot find words severe enough to denounce me, because I oppose servile insurrection."

Our readers know that this is wholly without foundation. We have never advocated insurrection, nor denounced any one for opposing it. We have uniformly said that the ballot-box, not the cartridge-box, is the true weapon.

Why does Mr. Clay shrink from meeting us, on the true issue as we present it?

Have" the Radical abolitionists, who held that there is no law for slavery; an individual right to freedom of speech and of the press for the proponents of their point of view, right, as seemed to Mr. Clay, to propagate his? "What is what we have affirmed: but Mr. Clay has repeatedly denied it, and still so does he keep leaving the very same old policy of so doing, because he calls it the way to expiate the pro-slavery sinners, and he says as a duty, the exercise of his own right. He must needs have an oligarchy take away the rights of Americans in order to secure his own rights and the rights of themselves. He raise his clannish ship of freedom. Kentucky, as we have slaveholders?"

He *accuses* them of being insurrectionists, and intimates that this fact furnished a reason for their legislative proscription. This is a new discovery of his, and seems evidently resorted to for the purpose of shifting the issue. His former charge against them was simply that they were Radical Abolitionists and held that there was no law

slavery. He does not expect Mr. Fee of desiring instruction, but admits that his party have such desire. Where is this proof? He pretends to find proof in *The Freeman*, the "New York organ" for which a man of Kentucky is responsible, and which is the organ of one but the Editor, Publisher, and Proprietor—*The Freeman* which no one desires to see resurrected than does Mr. Fee. Why does he not specify which of the exiles were attracted, and by the means of what? Was it Rev. J. S. Davis? Was it Rev. Mr. Rogers? Was it Mr. John G. Harpoe? Will Mr. Bayly say *upon* he accuses? Will he comport with the character which he has himself given them?

Mr. Clay says that he said, at Chicago, that there was no law for slavery. Mr. Clay's memory of this differs from that of at least one of our elbow, who heard him. The point, however, we shall not debate. There has been some mistake. But what if he should have said so. Would he have been in error? Is this last letter of his, before us, he admits that he said in his Chicago speech, "we laws could restrain the tyranny of slavery." What is this but saying that slavery is lawless? And can lawlessness have "legal sanction"? He admits that he said "Negro slavery is as great and absolute a despotism, as the white has seen. And pray, what does Mr. Clay understand a despotism to be? Can there be any law against despotism? Can there be any law against slavery? Also, constitution or law, can there be any law that forbids his defiance to all laws and exists only in its absence? He admits that he said, "The idea of making laws to regulate such an institution is all law." Can he deny the fact that the idea of creating by law an "institution" which cannot even "regulate" is a humbug? For declaring "a humbug" are Radical Abolitionists to be denounced as insurrectionists and banished from their native Kentucky at the instigation of the Kentucky orator at Chicago?

We tell Cassius M. Clay, honestly, earnestly, truthfully, that it is all a "humbug" for him or for any man to attempt riding two hobbies, at one and the same time. If he intends to go against slavery, let him cease talking of a "legal sanction" for slavery. If he sees clearly that "the idea of making laws to regulate slavery is all humbug" let him cut himself loose from the "humbug" of pretending to "regulate

[illegible]

And why is Cassius M. Clay that *he* should proscribe Abolitionists for being insurrectionary? Has *he* not distinctly threatened or predicted a civil war, if *his* own liberty of speech is not respected? And has *he* not claimed that in such a contest, *his* cause is the cause of the whole country, thus inviting northern interference by force, to protect human freedom in Kentucky? What could Radical Abolitionists, what can







